

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

STEVEN RONALD HONMA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B292758

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. LA064672)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Thomas Robinson, Judge. Affirmed.

Benjamin Owens, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On November 17, 2011, a jury convicted Steven Ronald Honma of voluntary manslaughter (Pen. Code, § 192, subd. (a)) and found true the allegation Honma personally used a firearm in the commission of the crime (*id.*, § 12022.5, subd. (a)). The trial court sentenced Honma to the upper term of 11 years plus an addition 10 years for the firearm use enhancement. The court gave him 786 days of credit for time served, consisting of 684 days of actual credit and 102 days of conduct credit.

Honma appealed. On June 26, 2013, we affirmed the judgment.

On August 27, 2018, Honma filed a petition for recalculation of his presentence conduct credits, claiming he was due an additional 684 days of conduct credit pursuant to Penal Code section 2933, subdivision (e)(1).

The trial court denied Honma's petition. It explained: "The appropriate custody credits were awarded to defendant Honma at the time of sentencing. Penal Code section 2933.1 was in effect at the time of this crime and the trial, and it remains in full force and effect, and because defendant Honma was convicted in this case of a violent felony, as defined in Penal Code section 667.5[, subdivision](c), his pre-sentence credits were properly limited to 15 percent." Honma appealed on September 17, 2018.

We appointed counsel to represent Honma on this appeal. After review of the record, Honma's counsel filed an opening brief requesting that this court independently review the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441. On January 14, 2019, we sent a letter to Honma, advising him that he he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. We received no response.

We have examined the entire record. We are satisfied that no arguable legal issues exist and that Honma's counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities. By virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, we are satisfied that Honma received adequate and effective appellate review of the order entered against him in this case. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441; accord, *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109-110.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

JOHNSON, Acting P. J.

We concur:

BENDIX, J.

WEINGART, J.*

* Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.